

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9-57, 60-100, 102-150 and 153-192 are pending in the application. Of those, claims 16-26, 38-52, 63-93, 109-119, 131-145 and 156-186 were previously withdrawn as being directed to a non-elected invention. Claims 8, 58, 59, 101, 151, and 152 were previously canceled without prejudice. Base claims 1 and 94 are amended. No new matter is added.

The systems and methods disclosed in amended base claims 1 and 94 allow a user to access newsgroup listings via an interactive television application that is implemented using user television equipment. A plurality of program listings in the interactive television application is displayed, where at least one of the newsgroup listings is cross-referenced to an aspect of the program listing (see, for example, Pages 6-7 of the Specification), which allows a user to easily find all newsgroups related to a specific topic of interest. In particular, a user can access a newsgroup related to any aspect of the program listing. Furthermore, if the displayed program listings change, the at least one newsgroup listing is updated (see Figures 4-6B and Page 31, line 27 to Page 36, line 22).

The Examiner asserts that base claims 1 and 94 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Stautner et al. in view of Farris et al. and Yen et al. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Stautner, Farris, and Yen, taken either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest cross-referencing a newsgroup listing to an aspect of a program listing and updating the at least one newsgroup listing when the displayed program listing changes, as recited in amended base claims 1 and 91, and thereby traverse the Examiner's rejections. In particular, Yen et al. do not teach cross-referencing a newsgroup listing to an aspect of a program listing and updating the at least one newsgroup listing when the displayed program listing changes.

To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).

The Examiner asserts that "crosslinking", as described in Yen et al. (See Yen et al., col. 8, lines 57-65), is the analogous to "cross-referencing" as recited in amended base claims 1 and 94.

Applicants strongly disagree. Yen et al. clarify the meaning of "crosslinking" at col. 11, lines 4-15, by stating:

Crosslinks to related items can include...a hypertext link to a web site being displayed in a picture from a broadcast show, a hypertext link to a web site being displayed in closed-caption text or other annotation information (for example, a commercial for a Ford pickup truck can include hypertext links to Ford's web site and to web sites for pickup truck comparisons..." (see Yen et al., col. 11, lines 4-11).

Thus, "crosslinking," as described by Yen et al., is the process of linking a first information source to a second information source via a "type of directive" such as a hypertext link that is embedded in the first information source. More importantly, a "crosslink" is provided by the first information source, itself. Yen et al. particularly provides the example "a commercial for a Ford pickup truck can include hypertext links..." (see Yen et al., col. 11, lines 8-9). Thus, the terms "crosslinking" of Yen et al. and "cross-referencing" in the pending application are not analogous because information sources in Yen et al. provide the crosslinks.

Even assuming, arguendo, that crosslinking and cross-referencing are analogous, Yen et al. do not teach, describe, or suggest an "interactive television application" in which the displayed "at least one newsgroup listing" is updated "when the displayed program listing changes", as recited as recited in amended base claims 1 and 94. In fact, because the crosslink is typically an embedded link, e.g., a hypertext link, that is a piece of software, it may not be easily updated. Yen et al. do not teach, describe, or suggest crosslinks that can be updated.

Because Yen et al. do not teach or suggest that "at least one of the program listings has at least one newsgroup listing cross-referenced to an aspect of the program listing by the interactive television application" and "updating the at least one newsgroup listing when the displayed program listing changes," Stautner et al. and Farris et al. in view of Yen fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of base claims 1 and 94. Therefore, there is no *prima facie* case of obviousness and the §103(a) Rejection of base claims 1 and 94 should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

We believe that we have appropriately provided for fees due in connection with this submission. However, if there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this Response, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-1945, under Order No. 003597-0154 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: March 4, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By /Tushar Parlkar/
Tushar Parlkar
Registration No.: 61,715
ROPES & GRAY LLP
One International Place
Boston, Massachusetts 02110
(617) 951-7000
(617) 951-7050 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant